

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15255

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES
Washington, D.C., June 3, 1964.

To the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE.

In our examination into the accuracy and reliability of selected information pertaining to the accelerated public works program reported to the Congress and other interested parties by the Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, we found that the reports contained significant overstatements of the number of jobs estimated to be created by accelerated public works projects approved by the Community Facilities Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency. We found also that the reports contained overstatements with respect to the number of actual man-months of work created by Community Facilities Administration-approved projects already under construction.

A comparison of the estimated 21,814 man-month of work reported by the Area Redevelopment Administration for the 190 projects included in this review with the 9,553 on-site man-months actually worked on these projects shows that the estimates were overstated by 12,261 man-months, or about 128 percent. If what we found in the 190 projects is true for the other Community Facilities Administration projects, the estimated 55,800 on-site man-years of work for the 2,842 projects approved by the Community Facilities Administration as of November 1, 1963, would appear to be overstated by about 31,000 man-years. The total number of man-years of work estimated to be created by all projects approved by the various participating departments and agencies as of November 1, 1963, was 93,400. Our examination also disclosed that the 50,853 on-site man-months reported as having actually been worked on 497 Community Facilities Administration projects were overstated by 23,008 man-months, or about 83 percent. Projecting this percentage of overstatement to that agency's 1,228 projects under construction at November 1, 1963, indicates that the reported 131,942 actual on-site man-months of work were overstated by about 60,000 man-months.

The overstatements resulted from inaccurate estimates by the applicants for grants and from the Community Facilities Administration's use of these inaccurate estimates, rather than contractor payroll information, to calculate the amount of actual on-site employment. As the Community Facilities Administration projects account for almost one-half of all funds appropriated for the accelerated public works program, these overstatements take on added significance.

The Community Facilities Administration and the Area Redevelopment Administration separately reviewed project payrolls and arrived at basically the same results as we did concerning the overstatements. Neither agency believes, however, that the projects reviewed are representative of all the Community Facilities Administration projects. The reviews covered almost all that agency's projects completed at the time, included large and small projects in large and small communities, accounted for about 15 percent of all the agency's projects under construction, and accounted for over 6 percent of all the agency's projects approved as of November 1, 1963.

After being advised of the nature and extent of our findings, the Area Redevelopment Administration revised the format of its report so that it no longer shows the cumulative number of man-months of on-site work created by individual projects. In addition, the Area Redevelopment Administration changed the method of determining on-site man-months of work. The actual basis previously prescribed to a

basis using the number of workers on the project site on one given day of the month.

We believe the change in the format of the directory and the change in the basis for determining on-site employment will not result in a meaningful report of the progress and accomplishments of the accelerated public works program with respect to the creation of employment. Accordingly, we are recommending that the Administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration devise a reporting system which can be used consistently to provide meaningful cumulative information on actual on-site man-months of work created by accelerated public works projects.

We are also recommending that the Administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration take steps to improve the reliability of the information reported in the directories of approved accelerated public works projects by periodically verifying information reported and evaluating procedures used to obtain such information. We are also recommending that the Commissioner, Community Facilities Administration, take steps to provide that procedures followed by that agency result in accurate reporting on its portion of the program. The Administrator has informed us that the Area Redevelopment Administration is giving serious consideration to our recommendation.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL.

SOLICITATION ACTIVITIES OF DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE AMONG GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, last January 23, I called attention to solicitation activities of the Democratic National Committee among career Government employees.

I declared at that time that the Democratic National Committee has other sources from which to draw upon without placing Government employees in the untenable position of being forced to attend a \$100 a ticket Democratic fundraising event on May 26. I felt then, as I still do, that such action is highly unethical and unfair—whether it be the Democratic Central Committee or the Republican Central Committee.

I hoped that this pressure tactic would be repudiated by Mr. Johnson and the responsible leaders of the Democratic Party. But it seems I hoped in vain.

According to an article appearing in the Washington Sunday Star of May 17, under the respected byline of Columnist Joseph Young, the Democratic National Committee stepped up its drive to get career Government employees to attend the affair on May 26. And, in fact, the drive apparently took on new facets—which, if permitted to continue, could very well spell the death knell of the civil service system as we know it today.

I quote several paragraphs from that column:

During the past week employees of grade 13 and above in the Agency for International Development, which is seeking to select out employees without regard to civil service laws, received invitations.

The invitations they more or less expected. But what chilled them was their civil service grade number written in ink on the corner of the invitation cards. The employees felt this is a not-too-subtle way of telling them their Agency ex-

pects them to attend if they hope to avoid the fate of being selected out of their jobs, should AID get this authority.

Mr. President, if AID furnished the Democratic National Committee the names of these employees, it is a clear violation of the law. It appears that the Agency did do so since, as Mr. Young put it:

The situation regarding AID employees and the fact that their grades were written on their invitations suggest the information may have come from AID.

AID officials have denied the information came officially from the Agency. But as anyone knows who has been around Washington for any time, it is rare when anything comes officially from any agency. But whether or not AID supplied the names, an investigation should be conducted to ascertain the sources from whence the names came.

If this situation is permitted to continue, it will spread—if, in fact, it already has not. To point this up, Mr. Young wrote a followup article on May 20 indicating that other Government agencies took the hint and, through various means of pressure of their own, brought pressure on employees to attend the affair.

As spelled out by the columnist, these agencies include the General Services Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration.

The civil service system should not be used as an instrument through which pressure of any kind can be exerted upon employees for political ends. Veiled threats undermine the system itself, and it brings discredit upon both the employees and the system.

These tactics of pressuring career employees must be halted. And President Johnson can do much to restore the good name of the Civil Service if he would publicly repudiate what has been occurring.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles, entitled "Drive Stepped Up To Sell Employees \$100 Tickets to Affair for Johnson," and "Pressure on U.S. Employees To Buy \$100 Dinner Tickets Protested," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, May 17, 1964]
DRIVE STEPPED UP TO SELL EMPLOYEES \$100 TICKETS TO AFFAIR FOR JOHNSON

(By Joseph Young)

The Democratic National Committee is stepping up its drive to get Government career employees to attend the \$100 a plate affair in honor of President Johnson on May 26 at the District of Columbia Armory.

Thousands of career employees in grade 9 and above have received invitations from the Democratic National Committee in the past few weeks. Many thousands of others had received invitations and follow-up letters during the past 3 months.

And the Democratic National Committee apparently has devised a new wrinkle to pressure Government careerists into attending.

During the past week employees of grade 13 and above in the Agency for International Development, which is seeking legislation to select out employees without regard to civil service laws, received invitations.

The invitations they more or less expected. But what chilled them was their civil serv-

15256

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 2

ice grade number written in ink on the corner of the invitation cards.

AID employees feel this is a not too subtle way of telling them their agency expects them to attend if they hope to avoid the fate of being selected out of their jobs, should AID get this authority.

While letters sent to Government employees at their homes, soliciting funds for political purposes, are not a violation of Federal laws, it is a violation if names of employees were furnished by the agencies for which they work.

It long has been taken for granted that many agencies do furnish such information to political organizations, but this is very difficult to prove.

However, the situation regarding AID employees and the fact that their grades were written on their invitations suggest the information may have come from AID.

AID officials emphatically deny the information came officially from the agency.

They acknowledge there are hundreds of organizational charts bearing the names of AID employees, their grades, job duties, etc., that are intended for official use only, and that someone at AID could have furnished a chart to the Democratic committee. They declare, however, that if this happened it was without the approval of AID.

[From the Washington Star, May 20, 1964]
PRESSURE ON U.S. EMPLOYEES TO BUY \$100
DINNER TICKETS PROTESTED
(By Joseph Young)

Increasing pressure is being brought to bear on Government career employees to attend Tuesday's \$100 a ticket testimonial affair for President Johnson at the District of Columbia Armory.

Some agencies are following up the Democratic National Committee's mailed "invitations" to attend the affair by various means of pressure of their own to get their employees to buy tickets.

General Services Administration career employees have complained that in some instances their immediate bosses have emphasized the agency's desire to make a "good record" in regard to ticket buying and urged that they purchase the \$100 ducats.

Representative NELSEN, Republican, of Minnesota, charges that Rural Electrification Administration employees are being coerced into buying the \$100 tickets.

In a letter to President Johnson, Mr. NELSEN, who formerly was REA administrator, charged that REA officials are selling the tickets to the employees on the agency premises in violation of civil service rules which prohibit solicitation of political funds or selling of political party tickets in Federal buildings.

Mr. NELSEN said he has received complaints from REA employees in grades 13 and above that they are being called to the office of their boss and told to buy the \$100 tickets. In some cases their checks are being accepted right in the building.

Many thousands of Government career employees here in grades 11 and above have received invitations to attend the \$100 affair from the Democratic National Committee. Now, as the affair draws near, some of the agencies are getting into the act to "persuade" their employees to accept the "invitation."

CEASE-FIRE CALLED FOR IN LAOS— WHY NOT IN SOUTH VIETNAM?

HOW MUCH BETTER THAN GOP SOUTHEAST ASIA
ALL-OUT WAR POLICY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate President Johnson and Secretary of State Dean Rusk on their joining Britain, Canada, Thailand,

and South Vietnam in calling for a cease-fire in Laos.

So far so good, and a most hopeful sign of possibly a new orientation in our southeast Asia policy.

But our action in calling for a cease-fire in Laos should be extended to include a call for a cease-fire in South Vietnam.

On June 3, 1964, I stated on the floor of the Senate:

A United Nations sponsored cease-fire in South Vietnam is needed now.

It is becoming increasingly evident to more and more people in the United States—as well as to our allies around the globe—that the undeclared war in South Vietnam into which the United States has needlessly injected itself, can and will ultimately be settled only at the conference table. It cannot and will not be settled by military might.

In the more than 3 weeks that have elapsed since then, we have seen an increase in bellicose talks about what we are prepared to do to escalate the undeclared war in South Vietnam; we have read about more deaths of U.S. fighting "advisers" in battle, and have witnessed a complete shitting of the U.S. command in South Vietnam.

And, in recent days, we have read about a Republican policy work-group recommendation on what we should do in South Vietnam that is so unrealistic and so "far out" as to be positively frightening. The GOP policy statement—if adopted by the Republican Party—would make it truly a war party and is in sharp contrast to the President's recent move to contain the conflict in Laos by calling for a cease-fire to stop the senseless loss of human life there, to stabilize the situation, and to bring the issues to the conference table.

This is the policy I continue to urge be extended to South Vietnam.

One thing that can be stated with certainty with respect to our military excursion into South Vietnam: we are not there to subjugate the people of that country to our will and to make of that country an American colony. It is not now and never has been the policy of the United States to conquer foreign countries.

The GOP would-be foreign policymakers would now have the United States reverse its traditional principles and seek to conquer other nations militarily and hold them subjugated by military might.

What is the proposed GOP foreign policy vis-a-vis South Vietnam?

The final report of the Republican task force on "American Strategy and Strength" has this to say about South Vietnam:

The United States must make a full-scale commitment to halt Communist China's military expansion and subversion in Asia and in the Pacific.

A victory in South Vietnam over the military and subversive threats of communism is urgently required. We must repeal today's complacent commitment "to prevent a Communist victory" and substitute a commitment to insure a victory for freedom. And, once southeast Asia is free to pursue the development of democratic institutions of its own choice, the United States should then withdraw its troops and help stabilize the area and to protect it from the Communist threat.

This belligerent Republican statement is alarming enough when one realizes that its main emphasis is on war rather than peace. It becomes even more frightening in the context of the interpretation given it by the chairman of the task force, Congressman GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan.

When questioned by reporters, Congressman FORD stated that the following steps should be taken immediately:

American forces must take command of the forces in Vietnam and not simply remain advisers. He called the present policy one reason why we haven't done as well as we should have done.

U.S. strategy ought to be aimed at sealing off South Vietnam, preventing the infiltration from North Vietnam. Mr. FORD said this could be done by sending more U.S. special forces to Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire account in the New York Times for June 30, 1964, dealing with the GOP report be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, these two suggestions are patently absurd, unrealistic, and dangerous. Even in a political year and to serve political ends they should not be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, theoretically, there is a legitimate government in South Vietnam—however much it may be our puppet government. At least we consider it sufficiently legitimate to utilize its request for assistance as justification for our military operations there.

Now come the GOP would-be foreign policymakers and suggest that General Westmoreland push General Khanh aside and take over the running of South Vietnam. Presumably the South Vietnamese—after fighting and dying for years to drive the French out of the country—would cheer loudly as the U.S. conquerors usurped their government.

Our able and distinguished majority leader, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, is to be highly commended for his remarks yesterday in which he accurately pointed out the utter folly of the GOP proposal for the U.S. takeover of the South Vietnamese Government. With his intimate knowledge of events in southeast Asia, Senator MANSFIELD correctly labeled the GOP proposal as a purely political statement designed to drag South Vietnam into the forthcoming presidential campaign as a political issue.

What makes the GOP would-be foreign policymakers believe that the Vietnamese officers would take orders from U.S. officers?

And, if we forcibly deposed those officers, what makes the GOP would-be foreign policymakers believe that the Vietnamese soldiers would obey the com-

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15257

mands of U.S. officers to go out and fight when the Vietnamese officers are having difficulty making them do so?

And, if the Vietnamese soldiers refused to fight on the orders of U.S. officers would we punish them? If we did, what would we be punishing them for? For treason against the Government of South Vietnam, which we deposed?

Or would we be punishing them for treason against the United States, to which they owe no loyalty?

We would soon find that the South Vietnamese soldiers were staying behind while U.S. soldiers went out to fight the Vietcong.

This would amount to U.S. soldiers fighting against Vietcong soldiers—many of them brothers, and fathers, and cousins of the South Vietnamese soldiers who were no longer fighting.

Of course there is always the difficulty of recognizing a Vietcong from a Vietnamese. They wear no distinguishing marks. Their thoughts and loyalties do not appear in their appearance.

But then look at the world position of the United States if we followed the advice of the Republican foreign policymakers. The world would see U.S. soldiers—and only U.S. soldiers—fighting a war of conquest in Vietnam. It would again be white men pitted against the Vietnamese.

But suppose we won an apparent temporary military decision. Suppose we succeeded in identifying all the Vietcong and containing them behind barbed wire. Suppose we threw all the North Vietnamese out of South Vietnam, sealed the borders with U.S. soldiers, and had the country all to ourselves.

Where would we be then?

We would have the hundreds of thousands of Vietcong men, women, and children behind barbed wire. We would have to feed and clothe them well into the future.

We would have to continue to govern the remaining South Vietnamese well into the future.

We would have to seal off the borders with U.S. soldiers well into the future. And we would have a U.S. colony in southeast Asia.

This might have been considered an accomplishment in the 15th or 16th centuries, but not in the 20th century where the rule of international law should be given at least lipservice.

What about the South Vietnamese people not behind bars as suspected Vietcong? Would we have instilled in them a love of the United States as the great peacemaker who killed or imprisoned their fathers, brothers, and cousins? Would we have to remain in that country forever to insure that the prisoners were not released? Is this the way to spread the light of democracy abroad?

It most assuredly is not.

The GOP would-be policymakers are advocating war and the perpetual colonization of South Vietnam and its peoples.

The action to be taken with respect to South Vietnam is to wage peace—to call for a cease-fire immediately and to take the matter before the United Nations.

The United States and some of its allies have taken the first step in that

road in Laos. The time has come to call for an immediate cease-fire not only in Laos, but in South Vietnam as well. And it should be within, not outside, the auspices of the United Nations.

Those who oppose this logical and peaceful approach to a potentially dangerous situation attempt to find objections wherever they can.

First of all let us repeat that we are not adhering to article 33 of the charter which states:

The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

There also are those who say that the United Nations is not a proper forum because Red China and North Vietnam are not members of the United Nations. Article 32 of chapter V of the United Nations Charter makes specific provisions for such a situation when it states:

Any member of the United Nations which is not a member of the Security Council or any state which is not a member of the United Nations, if it is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council, shall be invited to participate, without vote, in the discussion relating to the dispute. The Security Council shall lay down such conditions as it deems just for the participation of a state which is not a member of the United Nations.

The charter of the United Nations thus clearly contemplates that the Security Council will have before it disputes involving both member and non-member states.

But, say the detractors from this peaceful approach, the Soviet Union in the Security Council will surely veto any call for a cease-fire.

There are two answers to these detractors.

In the first place, let us at least try this route and see. If the Soviet Union does veto the proposal in the Security Council it will be held up before all the world as blocking a peaceful solution to a threat to the security of the world.

In the second place, if the Security Council route is blocked, we can proceed to the General Assembly. Under the "uniting for peace" resolution adopted by the General Assembly on November 3, 1950—at the time of the Korean crisis—it is provided:

The General Assembly—

Resolves, That if the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, fails to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of the international peace and security in any case where there appears to be a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, the General Assembly shall consider the matter immediately with a view to making appropriate recommendations to members for collective measures, including in the case of a breach of the peace or act of aggression the use of armed force when necessary, to maintain or restore international peace and security. If not in session at the time, the General Assembly may meet in emergency special session within 24 hours of the request therefor. Such emergency special session shall be called if requested by any seven members, or by a

majority of the members of the United Nations.

There are ways to a peaceful solution in Vietnam and in all southeast Asia if we would but pursue them.

James Reston in the New York Times on July 1 put his finger on the difficulties inherent in heeding the warlike utterances of the GOP would-be foreign policy makers when he stated:

Something very odd is happening here to the Republican Party, when responsible leaders of the GOP like Ford, who for years have been contrasting the Republicans as the "party of peace" with the Democrats as the "war party," are now calling for instant victory in a jungle war 8,000 miles from home, right up against the borders of China which commands the allegiance of almost a quarter of the human race.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Reston's entire column be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the United Nations route is the only route to follow in southeastern Asia. President Johnson and Secretary Rusk, having taken the first step in that direction with respect to Laos, should be encouraged to take the next step to bring the South Vietnamese problem before the United Nations.

The advice given by the GOP would-be foreign policymakers should be recognized and labeled for what it is—a political attempt to drag into the presidential campaign an issue which should be above politics and to take a stand which, even though unrealistic, impractical, and dangerous, sounds alluring to the unknowing.

But this siren call of the GOP would-be foreign policymakers will not prove alluring to the vast majority of the American people faced with the loss of their loved ones in the steaming jungles of far-off South Vietnam. The mail I have been receiving proves that. It is running better than 100 to 1 in favor of my stand that we should take the Vietnam issue out of the battlelines and place it on the conference table in the United Nations.

[From the New York Times, June 30, 1964]

EXHIBIT No. 1

GOP BLOC SCORES POLICY IN VIETNAM—
HOUSE GROUP SAYS UNITED STATES HAS
"WHY WIN?" STANCE—URGES STEPPED-UP
FIGHT ON REDS

WASHINGTON, June 29.—A group of Republican Representatives, opposing the views of Henry Cabot Lodge, thrust the Vietnam war further into the political arena today.

It accused the Johnson administration of following a "Why win?" policy in South Vietnam and recommended a more active U.S. role in an intensified effort against Red guerrillas.

The Republican House group, headed by GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan, made its attack on Vietnam policy part of a general criticism of what it called the Democratic administration's pervasive softness against the worldwide threat of communism.

"The administration's tragically misguided reading of Soviet intentions has become the impetus for a new mood of misplaced trust," the group's report said.

"We are letting down our guard."

15258

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 2

TWO STEPS SUGGESTED

Pressed for an explanation of how the Republicans would wage war in South Vietnam, Representative Ford told a news conference that these steps should be taken immediately:

"American forces must take command of the forces in Vietnam and not simply remain advisers. He called the present policy one reason why we haven't done as well as we should have done.

U.S. strategy "ought to be aimed at sealing off South Vietnam, preventing the infiltration from North Vietnam." Mr. Ford said this could be done by sending more U.S. Special Forces to Vietnam.

Special forces are units trained intensively in guerrilla combat.

Mr. Ford said Republicans would wait to see how these worked before suggesting other steps. Other steps that have been advocated by critics of the administration have included the bombing of Communist supply lines in Communist supply lines in Communist North Vietnam.

Mr. Lodge, who has resigned as Ambassador to South Vietnam to help Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania, fight Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, for the Republican presidential nomination, told newsmen today that "I don't see how it is practical to make this (the war in South Vietnam) a political issue."

"Obviously there is no victory yet," Mr. Lodge said. "But I believe that if we persevere, there isn't any question at all that there will be a victory in South Vietnam."

Asked about the difference between the task force and Mr. Lodge, Mr. Ford replied:

"We are worse off there (Vietnam) than we were 4 years ago. If Lodge believes we have been successful, we are in opposition."

Mr. Ford, however, declined to assign any responsibility for any lack of success to Mr. Lodge.

"Lodge has been carrying out policies enunciated by the White House," Mr. Ford said.

Asked whether Vietnam should be a campaign issue, Mr. Ford replied:

"The problem of South Vietnam will be a legitimate area of political discussion from now until November."

The task force was composed of some of the most influential Republicans in the House. Mr. Ford is chairman of the House Republican Conference.

Some others on the task force are:

MELVIN E. LAIRD, of Wisconsin, who will head the platform committee at the Republican National Convention; WILLIAM E. MILLER, of upstate New York, the Republican national chairman; LESLIE C. AREND, of Illinois, the assistant Republican leader in the House and the ranking Republican on the House Armed Services Committee; and FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, the ranking Republican on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

EXHIBIT No. 2

[From the New York Times, July 1, 1964]
HOW TO MAKE THINGS WORSE THAN THEY REALLY ARE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, June 30.—The first major foreign policy issue of the election campaign is developing over Vietnam, and it illustrates the dangers of letting campaign rhetoric influence fundamental decisions on peace and war.

The Republicans are insisting, quite rightly, that Vietnam is a proper subject for criticism and debate between the parties, but they are also insisting that the policy of the United States in that country must be to achieve total victory.

The Johnson administration is less adventuresome. Its stated policy is to avoid a Communist victory, but lately, under the

pressure of events in Saigon and of politics here, it has been talking rather more boldly about winning the war there, and Secretary of State Rusk has even gone as far as to suggest that the defense of Vietnam is as vital to the security of the United States as the defense of Berlin and West Germany.

FRANCE'S AGONY

Before we confuse what is good politics with what is good policy or even good sense, maybe we should take a look at the history of that melancholy peninsula. The French were in control there for 70 years, except during the Japanese occupation during World War II.

They finally gave up and left just 10 years ago this coming month, at 0340 Geneva time, July 21, 1954 to be exact. They were not merely advising the anti-Communist Vietnamese against Ho Chi Minh's Communist Vietminh guerrillas. They had 400,000 of their best troops directly involved in the struggle and they were beaten, though even the French received considerable aid from the United States in the last years of the struggle.

Over a period of 8 years, that war cost France 172,000 casualties. The Vietminh lost a quarter of a million. Economically, from 1945 to 1955, France lost 10 times the total value of its vast investments in that country, and as Bernard B. Fall reports in "The Two Vietnams," "The French Army came out of the war a gaunt ghost of its former self, the cream of its regular officers dead and crippled, the rest of them embittered."

It is true that conditions there are not the same. The United States is guiding a counterinsurgency war there primarily to gain time to create a counterrevolution, but this is a slow business, and this is precisely the issue the Republicans are raising.

It is not only Senator GOLDWATER who is calling for a strategy of total victory, but the House Republican policy committee issued a detailed report this week that puts the point in more specific terms.

"A victory in South Vietnam over the military and subversive threats of communism," it said, "is urgently required. We must repeal today's complacent commitment to prevent a Communist victory and substitute a commitment to insure a victory for freedom."

But how is this to be done? Who is to repeal it? The committee does not tell us, but Representative GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan, the chairman of the House Republican conference and ranking Republican on the Defense Appropriations Committee who issued the report, wants the United States itself to take over the conduct of the war.

Something very odd is happening here to the Republican Party, when responsible leaders of the GOP like Ford, who for years have been contrasting the Republicans as the party of peace with the Democrats as the war party, are now calling for instant victory in a jungle war 8,000 miles from home, right up against the borders of China, which commands the allegiance of almost a quarter of the human race.

The Republican Party has managed to occupy the White House for only 8 out of the last 32 years, and it got there then only because General Eisenhower was regarded rightly as a prudent, experienced, and peaceful man.

Yet his successors in the party that is supposed to have unusual respect for history are now complaining, not that we are doing too much, but that we are doing too little; not that we should limit our objectives and our risks but that, as the Ford committee says, we should take the initiative in effecting a revolution of liberty throughout the world.

KENNAN'S WARNING

When George Kennan, who is one of our most experienced and articulate students of diplomatic career to sum up his views of America's

diplomatic blunders of the past, he blamed in particular:

"The American tendency to view any war in which we might be involved, not as a means of achieving limited objectives in the way of changes in a given status quo but as a struggle to the death between total virtue and total evil."

The United States has slowly, very slowly, come to ponder the wisdom of this observation in Vietnam, but in the emotion of the campaign, this limited exercise will be savagely attacked, and all we can hope is that the administration will not be pushed in the process into political promises it will not want to redeem in the future.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON ECONOMY PROGRAM FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a communication from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in which the economy program for the fiscal year 1965 is outlined.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATTACHMENT A

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES
RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FISCAL 1964
(SUPPLEMENTAL) AND FISCAL 1965 BUDGET
REQUESTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Conservation operations:

Budget request.....	\$98,750,000
Recommended reduction.....	707,000

This program should not require additional funds. According to the budget request, all but \$707,000 of the estimated \$2.2 million increased costs for 1965 are to be offset by savings through increased efficiency. The budget indicates a reduction of 140 in the average number of employees for this program, a reduction of 3 million acres subject to conservation and no increase in the number of landowners and operators assisted. Further savings should be possible from additional district consolidations and increased financial support from established districts. Increased local contributions could also help overcome the backlog of unpublished survey reports, for which \$300,000 has been requested.

Great Plains conservation program:

Budget request.....	\$14,744,000
Recommended reduction.....	1,127,000

An annual increase in Federal funds is not essential to apply soil-conserving practices to an ever-increasing acreage of cropland. The requested increase is based primarily on the accumulation of applications for cost-share assistance, in which the Government shares up to 80 percent of the cost. It stands to reason that if the Government's percentage share was reduced, particularly on the less expensive conservation practices, the same amount of funds would provide assistance to more ranchers and cut down on the backlog of applicants. The number of applicants may decline very little, if any. In fact, the acreage treated would increase. Furthermore, participants would be more inclined to respond to the Department's suggestion that they "use other available sources of assistance," such as the nationwide agricultural conservation program under which the average cost-share portion of the Federal Government is only 50 percent.

POVERTY PROGRAM

will trigger a variety of additional programs for congressional con-